



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,798	12/04/2003	Phillip M. Adams	2456.2.13.1	6835
28049	7590	05/04/2010	EXAMINER	
PATE PIERCE & BAIRD 175 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1250 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/04/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/727,798	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ADAMS, PHILLIP M.
	<b>Examiner</b> Gabrielle McCormick	<b>Art Unit</b> 3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2010.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-13,17-20 and 23-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-8, 10-13, 17-20 and 23-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Status of Claims***

1. This action is in reply to the amendment filed on April 12, 2010.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10, 17-20 and 23 have been amended.
3. Claims 24 and 25 have been added.
4. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-13, 17-20 and 23-25 are currently pending and have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
7. Claim 19 recites that each set comprises **all** courses that are substantially equivalent. Because claim 1 performs the identifying of equivalencies based on comparing text course content, it does not limit the scope of the courses for comparison to those that are based on XML tags or standardized codes, as in claims 20 and 23. The specification discloses that equivalency is determined from participating schools using XML tags. Therefore, the specification does not disclose that the sets comprise **all** courses that are equivalent. They can only comprise those equivalent courses that use the XML tags.

8. Applicant's amendment to claims 4-8, 20 and 23 overcomes the previous rejection under 112, first paragraph. The Examiner thanks the Applicant for providing the clarification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-2, 10-13 and 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (US Pub. No. 2002/0049743) in view of Wenger (US Pub. No. 2003/0233242) in view of Fields et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0055842, hereinafter referred to as "Fields") in view of Curriculum Sequencing (found at <http://www10.org/cdrom/papers/207/node5.html>, published 2001-02-13).
11. **Claims 1 and 18-19:** Hall, at P[0029], discloses first and second pluralities of courses from first and second institutions where the first institution has degree requirements. Hall discloses an example degree plan for zoology where the system assembles a course map of courses available from various academic content providers (i.e., first and second institutions) which are required for the zoology degree (thus courses are collectively presented that satisfy degree requirements). Hall discloses identifying equivalency of courses. (P[0022]: aggregator correlates courses from a junior college to their equivalent at a university and P[0023]: substantially identical courses are offered). The course information is further categorized by variables, including course availability and location (i.e., course scheduling information) and course prerequisites (thus the information is organized in a hierarchy of requirements) (P[0029]). Clients (i.e., students) have access to degree plans (P[0021]), thus students select a first degree.
12. Hall's system uses software agents to gather information from providers in response to a user request (P[0027]), thus, Hall does not disclose a sequence of events where the determining of

equivalencies and storage of records (sets) reflecting equivalencies is performed prior to the user requesting course information. Note: Hall does disclose that curricula, degree plans, subjects and course schedules are prepared prior to user interaction. (P[0021]).

13. Wenger, however, discloses a system where partner schools participate to create a Database of Equivalencies (P[0026]). The equivalencies have been formalized between the ACE system and college course from partner schools. (P[0036]). The Database of Equivalencies specifies whether credits will defray credits required for a specific program (i.e., course for satisfying a degree requirement). Reports can be run that relate an input course from one school or courses from a partner school and can be grouped (i.e., sets are created) by equivalent course number. (P[0087]). The account holder of the system (i.e., students) can compare their transcript records to the sets of equivalencies at each school in the system (the system contains sets comprising all courses) to determine academic credits. (P[0089]. Thus, the equivalencies of the courses between the schools have been established prior to a student using the information. This results in the identification of equivalencies prior to a student's interaction with the system.
14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included creating a database of equivalencies, as disclosed by Wenger, in the system of Hall for the motivation of speeding processing of requests for course information. It is obvious for Hall's database to store equivalency information for administration of the rewards program. It is also obvious for the database to store equivalency information used to create the course map of P[0029] of Hall.
15. Hall/Wenger does not disclose comparing by a computer system, text characterizing course content of the first and second plurality of courses.
16. Fields, however, discloses a system where keywords from course descriptions are compared and a match percentage is calculated and used to determine equivalency. (P[0027-0028]).
17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included Fields' method of determining equivalent courses in the system of Hall for the

motivation of correlating transfer credits to another institution, as well as determining a "substantially identical course" (Hall; P[0024]).

- 18. Hall discloses equivalent courses (P[0022 and 0024]) and generating a degree plan (P[0029]) does not disclose organizing or populating this information into a dependency graph.
- 19. Curriculum Sequencing, however, discloses "topics are represented in a dependency graph, with links representing the relationship between topics, which include prerequisite, co-requisite, related, and remedial." (pg. 1; para. 1).
- 20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included organizing the degree plan of Hall into the dependency graph of Curriculum Sequencing for the motivation of providing a method of visually depicting the courses required for a degree and their relationships. Hall discloses that courses have prerequisites, therefore it is an obvious expansion to use a graphical technique to show these relationships.
- 21. **Claim 2:** Hall discloses data mining. (P[0026]) and access to university curricula and course schedules (i.e., catalog information).
- 22. **Claims 10 and 11:** Hall discloses a student selecting a course from a given provider based on cost. (P[0024]) and filtering search results based on relevancy to the client's query. (P[0028]).
- 23. **Claims 12 and 13:** Hall discloses course availability (i.e., scheduling information) and generating a "custom course map degree plan based on course offerings". (P[0029]). The custom course map is understood to comprise a class schedule as it is based on course offerings, availability and location.
- 24. **Claim 17:** Hall discloses transferring credits (P[0022]). Hall further discloses viewing the degree plan with the courses needed to be completed in order to obtain the degree. (P[0029]). Thus, the transferred courses are imported such that only the courses needed to be completed are viewed.

25. **Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (US Pub. No. 2002/0049743) in view of Wenger (US Pub. No. 2003/0233242) in view of Fields et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0055842, hereinafter referred to as "Fields") in view of Curriculum Sequencing (found at <http://www10.org/cdrom/papers/207/node5.html>, published 2001-02-13) and in further view of ABA ("Data that supports 1 to 1". American Bankers Association. ABA Banking Journal. New York: Oct 2000. Vol. 92, Iss.10; pg. 60).
26. **Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8:** Hall does not disclose a standardized coding system created by an unaffiliated third party or delimiting analogous text with standardized codes to enable comparison.
27. Fields, however, discloses determining equivalent course information using course title and keyword matching (i.e., text) with a match percent threshold (P[0027-0028]). Fields does not disclose standardized codes created by an unaffiliated third party.
28. ABA discloses that the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and a consortium of tech and accounting firms (i.e., an unaffiliated third party) created a common taxonomy of financial terms by applying XML tags so that data could be universally exchanged and shared. Investors using an XML-capable browser can now perform side-by-side comparisons of companies (thus the data is displayed in an XML web page). (pg. 2; para. 13-16).
29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a third party creating standardized codes (using XML tags) to enable comparison, as disclosed by ABA, in the system of Fields for the motivation of facilitating transfer credit determinations. In P[0049], Fields discloses that future transferees from the same college will have their information evaluated against the stored course description. By expanding Fields to include a standardized code, the evaluation is simplified.
30. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included Fields' method of determining analogous courses in the system of Hall for the motivation of correlating transfer credits to another institution, as well as determining a "substantially identical course" (Hall; P[0024]).

31. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (US Pub. No. 2002/0049743) in view of Wenger (US Pub. No. 2003/0233242) in view of Fields et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0055842, hereinafter referred to as "Fields") in view of Curriculum Sequencing (found at <http://www10.org/cdrom/papers/207/node5.html>, published 2001-02-13) and in further view of ABA ("Data that supports 1 to 1". American Bankers Association. ABA Banking Journal. New York: Oct 2000. Vol. 92, Iss.10; pg. 60) in further view of Danner et al. (US Pat. No. 6,711,618, hereinafter referred to as "Danner").
32. Claim 6: Hall does not disclose XML tags embedded in HTML pages.
33. Danner, however, discloses XML tags embedded in HTML code. (C8; L57-65).
34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included XML tags and pages, as disclosed by Danner, in the system of Hall for the motivation of providing formatting instructions and providing the content for display.
35. Claims 20 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (US Pub. No. 2002/0049743) in view of Wenger (US Pub. No. 2003/0233242) in view of Fields et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0055842, hereinafter referred to as "Fields") in view of ABA ("Data that supports 1 to 1". American Bankers Association. ABA Banking Journal. New York: Oct 2000. Vol. 92, Iss.10; pg. 60) in view of Eguchi et al. ("Rule-based XML". Artificial Intelligence and Law. Dordrecht: 2002. Vol. 10, Iss. 4; pg. 283, hereinafter referred to as "Eguchi").
36. Claims 20 and 25: Hall discloses
  - identifying first and second pluralities of courses from first and second institutions where the first institution has degree requirements. (P[0029]: an example degree plan for zoology where the system assembles a course map of courses available from various academic content providers (i.e., first and second institutions) which are required for the zoology degree (thus courses are collectively presented that satisfy degree requirements).

- identifying equivalency of courses. (P[0022]: aggregator correlates courses from a junior college to their equivalent at a university and P[0023]: substantially identical courses are offered).
- presenting the plurality of degrees to a student. (P[0021]).
- selecting a first degree (P[0021]: Clients (i.e., students) have access to degree plans thus students select a first degree and P[0029]: zoology is degree exemplified.)
- populating and presenting a curriculum with selected courses satisfying, according to the equivalencies, the first degree requirements (P[0022 and 0024]: equivalent courses are determined; P[0029]: degree plan is selected with a variety of courses offered by different content providers. A custom course map (i.e., curriculum) is created based on the course offerings from multiple content providers.)

37. Hall's system uses software agents to gather information from providers in response to a user request (P[0027]), thus, Hall does not disclose a sequence of events where the determining of equivalencies and storage of records (sets) reflecting equivalencies is performed prior to the user requesting course information. Note: Hall does disclose that curricula, degree plans, subjects and course schedules are prepared prior to user interaction. (P[0021]).

38. Wenger, however, discloses a system where partner schools participate to create a Database of Equivalencies (P[0026]). The equivalencies have been formalized between the ACE system and college course from partner schools. (P[0036]). The Database of Equivalencies specifies whether credits will defray credits required for a specific program (i.e., course for satisfying a degree requirement). Reports can be run that relate an input course from one school or courses from a partner school and can be grouped (i.e., sets are created) by equivalent course number. (P[0087]). The account holder of the system (i.e., students) can compare their transcript records to the sets of equivalencies at each school in the system (the system contains sets comprising all courses) to determine academic credits. (P[0089]. Thus, the equivalencies of the courses between the schools have been established prior to a student using the information. This results in the identification of equivalencies prior to a student's interaction with the system.

39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included creating a database of equivalencies, as disclosed by Wenger, in the system of Hall for the motivation of speeding processing of requests for course information. It is obvious for Hall's database to store equivalency information for administration of the rewards program. It is also obvious for the database to store equivalency information used to create the course map of P[0029] of Hall.
40. Hall/Wenger does not disclose identifying first and second text with XML tags to create XML pages, delimiting a first and second portion with identical XML tags to reflect equivalence of data type, providing the XML pages on a computer network or mining the pages to create a record of courses.
41. Fields, however, discloses determining equivalent course information using course title and keyword matching (i.e., text) with a match percent threshold (P[0027-0028]).
42. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included Fields' method of determining equivalent courses in the system of Hall for the motivation of correlating transfer credits to another institution, as well as determining a "substantially identical course" (Hall; P[0024]).
43. ABA discloses a common taxonomy of financial terms by applying XML tags so that data could be universally exchanged and shared. Investors using an XML-capable browser can now perform side-by-side comparisons of companies (thus the data is mined from and is displayed in an XML web page). (pg. 2; para. 13-16). The use of "commonly defined tags" that results in "side-by-side comparisons" and automate financial reporting inherently comprise identical XML tags.
44. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included using identical XML tags in XML pages to enable comparison through mining, as disclosed by ABA, in the system of Fields for the motivation of facilitating transfer credit determinations. In P[0049], Fields discloses that future transferees from the same college will have their information evaluated against the stored course description. By expanding Fields to

include a standardized code such as a common taxonomy for XML tags, the evaluation is simplified.

45. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included Fields' method of determining analogous courses in the system of Hall for the motivation of correlating transfer credits to another institution, as well as determining a "substantially identical course" (Hall; P[0024]).
46. Eguchi discloses that XML tags delimit information and establish a structure using a parser to locate the tags to extract the information. (pg. 2; para. 4).
47. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the parser and delimiting of Eguchi in the common taxonomy XML-based system as taught by ABA since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.
48. **Claims 23 and 24:** Hall discloses
  - identifying a first and second catalog (P[0009]: aggregators has relationships with content providers and has access to an organization's databases that store institutional knowledge (i.e., a catalog) and P[0021]: aggregator provides access to subjects and course schedules (i.e., a catalog).)
  - offering first and second pluralities of courses from first and second institutions where the first institution has degree requirements. (P[0029]: an example degree plan for zoology where the system assembles a course map of courses available from various academic content providers (i.e., first and second institutions) which are required for the zoology degree (thus courses are collectively presented that satisfy degree requirements)).
  - identifying equivalency of courses. (P[0022]: aggregator correlates courses from a junior college to their equivalent at a university and P[0023]: substantially identical courses are offered).
  - presenting the plurality of degrees to a student. (P[0021]).

- selecting a first degree (P[0021]: Clients (i.e., students) have access to degree plans thus students select a first degree and P[0029]: zoology is degree exemplified.)
- selecting first and second courses. (P[0029]: information on zoology courses offered by each content provider are retrieved.)
- populating and presenting a curriculum with selected courses satisfying, according to the equivalencies, the first degree requirements (P[0022 and 0024]: equivalent courses are determined; P[0029]: degree plan is selected with a variety of courses offered by different content providers. A custom course map (i.e., curriculum) is created based on the course offerings from multiple content providers.)

49. Hall's system uses software agents to gather information from providers in response to a user request (P[0027]), thus, Hall does not disclose a sequence of events where the determining of equivalencies and storage of records (sets) reflecting equivalencies is performed prior to the user requesting course information. Note: Hall does disclose that curricula, degree plans, subjects and course schedules are prepared prior to user interaction. (P[0021]).

50. Wenger, however, discloses a system where partner schools participate to create a Database of Equivalencies (P[0026]). The equivalencies have been formalized between the ACE system and college course from partner schools. (P[0036]). The Database of Equivalencies specifies whether credits will defray credits required for a specific program (i.e., course for satisfying a degree requirement). Reports can be run that relate an input course from one school or courses from a partner school and can be grouped (i.e., sets are created) by equivalent course number. (P[0087]). The account holder of the system (i.e., students) can compare their transcript records to the sets of equivalencies at each school in the system (the system contains sets comprising all courses) to determine academic credits. (P[0089]. Thus, the equivalencies of the courses between the schools have been established prior to a student using the information. This results in the identification of equivalencies prior to a student's interaction with the system.

51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included creating a database of equivalencies, as disclosed by Wenger, in the system of

Hall for the motivation of speeding processing of requests for course information. It is obvious for Hall's database to store equivalency information for administration of the rewards program. It is also obvious for the database to store equivalency information used to create the course map of P[0029] of Hall.

52. Hall/Wenger does not disclose comparing by a computer system, text characterizing course content of the first and second plurality of courses. Note: course content is text from a catalog.

53. Fields, however, discloses a system where keywords from course descriptions are compared and a match percentage is calculated and used to determine equivalency. (P[0027-0028]).

54. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included Fields' method of determining equivalent courses in the system of Hall for the motivation of correlating transfer credits to another institution, as well as determining a "substantially identical course" (Hall; P[0024]).

55. Hall does not disclose a standardized coding system created by an independent third party or using identical standardized codes.

56. ABA discloses that the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and a consortium of tech and accounting firms (i.e., an unaffiliated third party) created a common taxonomy of financial terms by applying XML tags so that data could be universally exchanged and shared. Investors using an XML-capable browser can now perform side-by-side comparisons of companies (thus the data is mined from and is displayed in an XML web page). (pg. 2; para. 13-16). The use of "commonly defined tags" that result in "side-by-side comparisons" and automate financial reporting inherently comprise identical XML tags.

57. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included using identical XML tags in XML pages to enable comparison through mining, as disclosed by ABA, in the system of Fields for the motivation of facilitating transfer credit determinations. In P[0049], Fields discloses that future transferees from the same college will have their information evaluated against the stored course description. By expanding Fields to

include a standardized code such as a common taxonomy for XML tags, the evaluation is simplified.

58. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included Fields' method of determining analogous courses in the system of Hall for the motivation of correlating transfer credits to another institution, as well as determining a "substantially identical course" (Hall; P[0024]).
59. Hall does not disclose differentiating text by data type and delimiting data types using the standardized codes.
60. Eguchi discloses that XML tags delimit information and establish a structure using a parser to locate the tags to extract the information. (pg. 2; para. 4-5: motions are sent to a validating parser to ensure the document complies with the Court Document Standard, thus the validated motions have test that is delimited by the same standardized code (i.e., the XML tag) as the Court Document Standard).
61. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the parser and delimiting of Eguchi in the common taxonomy XML-based system as taught by ABA since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

62. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 20 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabrielle McCormick whose telephone number is (571)270-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (5:30 - 4:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629